

**JOINT CAPITAL BUDGET MEETING  
ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING COMMITTEE  
PARKS, SPORTS & CULTURAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

**Minutes**

A joint Capital Budget meeting of the Environment, Land Acquisition and Planning Committee and the Parks, Sports and Cultural Affairs Committee was held at the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, in the Rose Y. Caracappa Auditorium, on Wednesday, **May 29, 2002**, at 10:00 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Legislator David Bishop, Chair, Environment, Land Acquisition & Planning  
Legislator Ginny Fields, Chair, Parks, Sports & Cultural Affairs  
Legislator Michael Caracciolo, Vice-Chair, Environ., Land Acquisition & Planning  
Legislator Cameron Alden, Vice-Chair, Parks, Sports & Cultural Affairs  
Legislator Jon Cooper, Member  
Legislator Angie Carpenter, Member  
Legislator Brian Foley, Member  
Legislator William Lindsay, Member

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Fred Pollert, Director, Budget Review Office  
Kevin Duffy, Budget Review Office  
John Ortiz, Budget Review Office  
Mary Howe, Budget Review Office  
Kim Brandeau, Budget Review office  
Joe Muncey, Budget Review Office  
Sean Clancy, Budget Review Office  
Peter Scully, Commissioner, SC Department of Parks  
Tom Isles, Director, SC Planning Department  
Nicole DeAngelo, IR, County Executive's Office  
Barbara LoMoriello, Legislative Aide to Legislator Cooper  
Lance Mallamo, Vanderbilt Museum  
Vito Minei, Suffolk County Department of Health Services

*(The meeting was called to order at 10:20 a.m.)*

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to request that the Legislators that are in the building for the Environment, Land Acquisition and Parks Committee's hearing on the Capital Budget kindly return to the horseshoe so that we can commence today's meeting.

With a quorum being present, would everyone please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance to be led by Legislator Lindsay.

*(Salutation)*

I believe that Legislator Fields is either very close to arriving at this committee meeting or is in fact in the building. So, I am sure she will join us momentarily.

At this time I would like to invite up members from the various County departments to address the committee. Mr. Vito Minei, Tom Isles, Lance Mallamo. Gentlemen, would you like to come up? Parks Commissioner Peter Scully.

While we await the arrival of Chairwomen Fields, who chairs the Parks Committee, it probably would be more appropriate for Mr. Isles to make a presentation, if he has a prepared presentation for the committee, so that we can go into those aspects of the Land Acquisition, Environment Committee jurisdiction that is pertinent for this hearing. So, Mr. Isles, if you would like to lead off. And here she is. I knew she would be here.

*(Legislator Fields entered the meeting at 10:23 a.m.)*

**MR. ISLES:**

Would you like me to continue? Good morning. The Planning Department is requesting through the County Executive a total of \$13 million for land acquisitions in the year 2003. We are proposing this in three programs, farmland, affordable housing, and land preservation partnership. Farmland is proposed in the amount of \$5 million, and would continue this County's historical strong support for farmland. And I think in particular at this point in time it becomes especially important with the rate of development in many of our farm communities. So we feel that that is an important component, an important priority of the County administration and one we would ask for your support on today.

The second program, dealing with open space preservation, is the land preservation partnership, of which an amount of \$3 million is requested. The land preservation partnership, as you know, is a program that requires a 50% match from a municipality so that the money is leveraged to double that amount. So we can potentially get \$6 million of investment in open space preservation. And the program does permit a bit of latitude in terms of the acquisitions. They can be done for drinking water, for parkland, and also for farmland, for that matter. So, land preservation partnership has been a solid program of this County. We would request that it be continued.

And the third one is affordable housing. Affordable housing is a relatively new initiative. The Legislature initially approved the program with an anticipation of a \$20 million expenditure in the first three years of the program. We did receive and we appreciate a \$5 million appropriation at the end of last year. We are requesting another \$5 million for the year 2003.

I will point out that with all of the acquisition programs, all of the parcels to be acquired require legislative approval, so that any specific proposal, whether it be for affordable housing or farmland or land preservation partnership, would, of course, have to go through the committee cycle as well as the Legislature for your consideration. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Mr. Pollert, would you just summarize the BRO analyses of the various programs that Mr. Isles just spoke to and your recommendations.

**MR. POLLERT:**

On page 29 of our report, in very small type font, unfortunately, is a project description of all the

various land acquisition programs that are currently active as well as how much money has been spent year to date. The major policy issue for the Legislature this year is last year as a legislative initiative the County Legislature consolidated two land acquisition programs into a new program called the Multifaceted Land Acquisition Program. That consolidated capital project 7174, the Land Preservation Partnership Program, and capital project 8701, which is the acquisition of farmland.

This year the County Executive has again broken apart that multifaceted program into its different components. So, there is no disagreement with the amount of funding that has been proposed in the capital program. The legislative policy option is whether or not you want to maintain that consolidated project, which gives you the most degrees of freedom, or whether or not you wanted to break it into the components as recommended by the County Executive.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

That is a policy issue. In terms of recapping, Mr. Isles, the amount of funds available for the various County acquisition programs, could you just give us some numbers for each of the program categories, what's available, fund balances?

**MR. ISLES:**

Yes, I can. I would just make the point, too, that of course what we are talking about today is the capital budget. There is an ongoing revenue stream under the sales tax program that also funds open space and farmland as well as active parkland programs in the County.

In answer to your questions, the fund balances as of the beginning of April is what I have available at this time. Obviously, as this body knows, there has been an evaluation of the real estate acquisition program. There has been extensive consideration by the Legislature of the program, and that has caused a pause to the program. We are very much in the mode of getting the program moving at the rate that you expect. We have done some recent closings, and we have a number of parcels that are scheduled to close in the near future. So the numbers I am giving you are a little bit probably on the high side because of the review of the program that occurred in the first quarter of this year.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Let me just interrupt you because you obviously have something prepared that would be helpful if we had it before us. So, could we get a copy of that?

**MR. ISLES:**

Yes, and we did circulate to the Environment Committee, but certainly if this committee as a combined committee would like it, we can provide that to you.

But essentially the fund balance, as we know, we have old drinking water money of which we have a relatively small amount in there, about \$30,000. However, there will be an adjustment to that, probably in the range of about \$4 ½ million, on the final adjustment to the sales tax numbers in that old program.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

That would be an upward adjustment?

**MR. ISLES:**

Upward adjustment. In the accounting that's done, and then the final number in terms of what is due to the program.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

So, the old water quality protection program.

**MR. ISLES:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Will have, or does have, as of April, approximately four to four and a half million dollars fund balance?

**MR. ISLES:**

Right. That is what we expect at this point. The farmland program has a balance of about \$6.2 million. This is not considering in all cases items that are in negotiation and possibly in contract at this point. So, obviously, the actual amount available may be less than that.

Open space program has about \$3.9 million. And I am rounding the numbers, of course. The land preservation partnership is \$750,000. The South Setauket Woods, which is a specific program as part of the Northville settlement, is about \$ 1 ½ million. Greenways open space is about \$4.3 million. Greenways parkland is – we did have a recent acquisition in the Town of Southold, so we are down to about 6.8 million on that. Greenways farmland is about \$10.2 million. And the pay-as-you-go, which is the new ¼% sales tax program, is about \$4.3 million. And that obviously gets replenished as the sales tax proceeds are credited to the program.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

In the aggregate, then, what is the total?

**MR. ISLES:**

The aggregate here again, of what was available at the beginning of April, at that time, is about \$35 million through the various programs. And here again I am not considering the parcels that are in contract or are in negotiation at this point. Obviously that then deducts from the program.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Okay. Year-to-date approximately what has the County acquired through its various acquisition programs, both in terms of acreage and dollar amount? Can you give us a summary of that?

**MR. ISLES:**

We have closed on I believe approximately four parcels at this point. The dollar amount on that, I can give you the actual exact amount because we certainly do have it available. But if I can give you an estimate at this time it is probably in the range of about \$2 ½ million and the acreage is probably about 120 acres or so. But I can supply that to the committee in specifics.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Okay. As we have discussed in the Land Acquisition Committee, there have been numerous – my guess or recollection would be there are probably at least a dozen resolutions that have been approved by the committee and the Legislature since the beginning of the year that are in various stages of appraisal, appraisal review, planning steps. Am I correct about that?

**MR. ISLES:**

That is correct, yes.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

So in terms of the pipeline there is plenty of foot in terms of our acquisition programs being alive and well. The fact that you point out four parcels have been purchased really doesn't address the full scope or nature of the County acquisition program. So, again, I am going to take this occasion just to make a comment about the myth that the County is out of the acquisition business, that it is slowed down, it is halted, all as a result of the reform measures that were recently approved by the Legislature, that that is simply not the case. It takes time from the introduction of a resolution and the passage of same, for planning steps to actually go out, have the – order the appraisals, review those appraisals, contact the property owner, and attempt to successfully negotiate acquisitions. From beginning to end, approximately how much time is involved in an average acquisition?

**MR. ISLES:**

It certainly varies, but I would say the average might be six to eight months. Some go a little bit sooner, some obviously can take longer, depending on the negotiations. But I think your point is well taken in the sense that if we look at what is available and what acquisitions have occurred, that in itself doesn't really tell the full story in terms of what has been approved for appraisals and planning steps and so forth and what actually has been accepted in negotiations, what the Legislature has approved for actual acquisitions and appropriations. We have probably ten parcels that we expect to close by the end of June of this year, by the end of this quarter. There are many more lined up behind that that are good acquisitions consistent with the program goals. So, I feel very confident about the County's record in preserving farmland, preserving open space, and drinking water, moving forward in a very strong way in the future.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

I bring that up again today because again today there is an editorial in the daily newspaper for the bi-county region that talks about, you know, Mr. Grecco, and the effect on our land acquisition programs and it is time to get things moving again. Well, things have always moved. Nothing has really stopped, and I think it is incumbent upon people in both branches in County government to share that information with the media, because obviously they are not aware that our programs are alive and well. There is no shortage of land to be acquired or negotiations to be held and funds to be spent if and when we find purchases that are worthwhile.

Fred, on this presentation by Mr. Isles and his comment about the acquisition process taking between six and eight months, do you have any comments regarding that? In your view, is there any effort that should be made to expedite the process, or do you feel that that is a reasonable amount of time?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Given the fact of the previous track record that the County has had, together with the safeguards that you build in, it is a reasonable timeframe to acquire property. One of the concerns, of course, is if it stretches much beyond that there is a normal inflationary factor, which the Legislature was discussing, that if you have extensive delays, clearly you are not going to be able to maximize the revenues that you do have available with the acquisition of land. So, currently the acquisition program is being accomplished in a reasonable timeframe. If it started to stretch out much more, there would be perhaps some concern that inflation was getting ahead of our



revenue stream.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

Before we go on, perhaps you can just, Fred, give us a summary of the three year capital budget – an overview, rather, in terms of the dollar amounts and what implications that has on the County's debt service.

**MR. POLLERT:**

The introduction to the Budget Review Office Report this year identified and focused on the topic that the County has a fairly aggressive capital program and has had an aggressive capital program for a number of years. At this point in time there is a significant amount of authorized but unissued debt. What happens is the County Legislature appropriates funds, and that is really the last you see of a capital project. The Comptroller then goes out to issue the bonds when there is need for cash.

The amount of currently authorized but unissued debt represents about three years worth of normal expenditures. So, not so much in the land acquisition area but primarily in the areas that are covered by the Department of Public Works, where they have to progress a project, building projects, highway projects, Vanderbilt Museum projects, Community College projects, there is a significant backlog of projects.

The representation that we had made to the rating agencies is that our short-term plans were continuing to issue roughly \$70 million a year worth of debt. However, the Legislature is really approving more than \$70 million a year, so that backlog is continually increasing. The rating agencies are really not too concerned about it because we had represented that we were only going to be issuing about \$70 million a year. I think if we had gone to them and said to them that, gee, we want to get through the backlog in two years and it is our intention to be issuing another \$125 million worth of debt in addition to the 70 that we normally do, perhaps they would be concerned over that.

What is important to the Legislature to recognize is that there is this large group of projects that have already been appropriated by the Legislature and the Department of Public Works is really backlogged in attempting to progress many of those projects. So even if you appropriate funds now for a capital project, it could take a number of years before that project actually moves to completion.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

We have always had a chronic issue with respect to engineering positions in the department and their ability to keep pace with capital programs and projects that are approved. What is the current status? Do we still have that problem? What impact will the early retirement incentive have on the department in that respect, and to what extent are we using outside consultants on a cost effective basis to deal with that shortfall?

**MR. POLLERT:**

The Department of Public Works has approximately 30% of their staff that would be eligible for the early retirement incentive program. It is a greater percentage if you look at the professional engineering staff, because they have been there for a longer period of time. So potentially they could be very dramatically impacted by an early retirement incentive program.

The capital program does include project management costs with respect to construction

management being contracted out on one or two projects. Frankly, the department is backlogged. It is going to take a while to break out of the logjam unless the Legislature decides that they want to progress projects either through contracting with agencies like the Dormitory Authority as we did with Community College projects on the Health Wellness Center, or if you decide to change the format of the capital program where the department would actually go out as part of a two step process and do an RFP with a bid and then just appropriate the funds when, in fact, you have a firm bid coming back.

One of the difficulties with what we currently have is with a two or three year backlog in projects, a lot of the cost estimates that were done by the departments become very stale, and then to be able to fit within the envelope of the money that has been appropriated, they either scale back on the project or they have to come back to the Legislature to say that they need some additional funds.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

That is a point well made because I notice, for example, with the court proposal that is, in fact, what is happening. I am sure that is happening with other projects which, for whatever reason, were not proceeded with previously. It only adds cost. So from a cost effective standpoint it has a negative impact. You know, that is a policy that really the Legislature should take up. What would be your recommendation as to the most appropriate committee to address that need?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Probably the Department of Public Works Committee would be the most appropriate one because a lot of it ties in with the authorized resources that the department actually has. Likewise, it is not a unique problem just to the Department of Public Works. Quite often they have to look to the cooperation of departments as well. So, when they work on a parks project, they have to look for the cooperation of the Parks Department or the Vanderbilt Museum on those projects, likewise a lot of the County road projects have to have the efforts of the Law Department to acquire the land on the rights of way. So it is really a multifaceted problem. Sometimes the Department of Public Works is ready to move ahead with a project but there have been changes on the part of the department that the design plans are being made for, or they can't move a project because of backlogs and delays in the Law Department.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Then clearly this is an area that has to be addressed, because this –

**MR. POLLERT:**

That is across quite a few departments, yes.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

And again, what would be the best way to coordinate that effort so as to provide for a more cost effective approach to capital projects in the program. Because just looking at the court complex, I mean, already it has increased several million dollars. I know the Riverhead County Center -- which from the time of my arrival here has been a capital project that hasn't moved forward. And I am sure if we compare the cost today of doing those renovations and repairs, it probably has gone up significantly, if not doubled.

**MR. POLLERT:**

Yes. In fact, it has. The court complex, the funds that were originally included were to take care of the courts in both the eastern and western part of the County. Now the cost estimates have

increased to the point where the funds are only sufficient to do the courts at the east end of the Island. The funding is included in subsequent years for the planning of the courts at the western end, but on top of the backlog that the County currently has in projects, there were two or three major projects for which funds have not yet been appropriated that will continue to impact the workload for the Department of Public Works. They include the jail expansion, they include the Riverhead County Center, and they do include managing the court complex.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

I know Legislator Alden had a question.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Thanks, Mike. Just, Fred, along the same lines as far as that borrowing of money. I wanted to get back to just our acquisition programs and  $\frac{1}{4}\%$  sales. How much leverage was actually approved by the Legislature for that?

**MR. POLLERT:**

The application went into the EFC. I believe it is 65 million. Sixty-two million dollars.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Okay. Now, technically that should not impact our rating in that there is a dedicated source of money.

**MR. POLLERT:**

That is correct.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

But the problem still arises if our sales tax revenues fall-off, and then we have to – we have obligated ourselves to repay some of this debt. Then we are going to have to dip into the general funds to do that with. That could possibly impact on our debt rating, then, right? Bond rating.

**MR. POLLERT:**

Last year when the Legislature approved the {FC} application they had requested that Tom Isles and the Budget Review Office work to make sure that the dollar amount that was actually being requested had enough of a safety factor so that even if sales tax dropped off in the neighborhood of ten percent, we would continue to have enough coverage ratio. At this point in time, we believe that it could be a problem, but it is a remote possibility.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

It is just something that we have to watch as we go along. Before you mentioned that we like to stay constant. If we refinance or actually add on \$70 a year – that's pretty much what we have tried to do in the past, right?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Well, that's roughly what the bond issues have been on an annual basis. So the County has been able to progress roughly \$70 million worth of projects per year. The capital program for 2003 proposes bonding roughly \$112 million. So, the County can progress roughly \$70 million worth of projects based upon historical trends, but what is being proposed is appropriations of about \$112 million next year.



**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

I just want to go into that just a little bit because in your summary you do state that, I think, debt service actually decreases now because we have gone and refinanced at lower rates. So, there is a possibility we could kick up a little bit from the \$70 million and still maintain the same amount of debt service.

**MR. POLLERT:**

That is absolutely correct. But the difficulty is the Department of Public Works being able to progress projects in a timely fashion, to be able to expend more than \$70 million a year.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Okay. So basically what you have modeled this on, then, is the amount of people we have working there, the ability to spend that much – okay. I guess I am going to kick back to Tom for a minute.

Tom, in your plan, how much of that – we are going to do something around \$65 million, I guess. How much of your plan depends on using how much of that money?

**MR. ISLES:**

That money, it is a total amount of \$62 million, of which about \$41 million is for open space, drinking water protection. Twenty-one million would be for farmland protection. In terms of the rate of the expenditure, we expect that the application has been filed with EFC, the Environmental Facilities Corporation, and if everything goes according to plan, we expect to have access to that money beginning in October of this year. And the question then becomes the rate of the spending on that – and in terms of the rate that we have, in terms of the other monies available and so forth, it could take 12 months, it could take 18 months. It is going to be a function of a couple of different things, including the market, including the receptivity – especially of farmers – to participate in the program. This is really an untested area. So that whole half of the money we are getting is, or a third of it, pardon me, is untested as to whether the farmers will participate, because there are certain conditions that have to be satisfied. I am not sure if that answers your question.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

It didn't, but two-thirds of the money is tagged for actual acquisition, so for water protection and things like that. In your plan of acquisitions, how much of that money do you plan on spending on a yearly basis? Because we have authorization to borrow up to \$62 million. How much of that fits in?

**MR. ISLES:**

Well, potentially all of it does. I mean, potentially – the purpose of this is to, as I understand it from when we were authorized to make this application, is that EFC provides below market interest rates, which are now, I think, in the range of about 2% or so, and that the thought was that if we were to borrow a conservative amount of money relative to the revenues in the program, that that acquisition was important because obviously the rate of development in Suffolk County and especially in the east end is very rapid at this point of time. The rate of inflation, of real estate at least, recently has been, at least since 1999, has been double digits in the past couple of years. So that by moving forward with the program to speed up the

acquisition program – just keep in mind the ¼% program was designed over a 13 year period. This would take a portion of that, a large portion, the \$62 million, put it towards the front of the program, and in terms of how quickly that will be spent, here again, it is hard to give an exact answer to that, but I would guess that it could be spent within two years based on the rates of what we have been doing and what we are trying to do.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

How long did it take to spend the Greenways?

**MR. ISLES:**

Greenways was approved in 1998. I guess we started having access to it in 1999. We still have some Greenways, as I just went through on. So the – I mean, if we were looking at it from another perspective, is how much did we spend in the past couple of years for acquisitions. Last year we did \$50 million, so, to give you a perspective on that.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

But to get back to maybe a comment that was made by Legislator Caracciolo earlier. We have plenty of money to spend, to buy land and preserve open space and preserve or protect our drinking water and things of that nature. Is that not correct?

**MR. ISLES:**

Well, the only point I would make on that when we say we have plenty of money, here again, historically we have been spending ranges from 40 to \$50 million in the last few years. If you look at, for example, the issue of farmland, where we have about 9,000 acres that we have purchased in the past 25 years, we are seeing many, many applications in the east end, in the Town of Riverhead and so forth, for development. We know that we can't wait forever to buy further farmland to protect that.

The Farmland Protection Plan that was prepared by the County in 1996 recommends the preservation of 20,000 acres of farmland in Suffolk County. So, we have 11,000 acres to go. And at the rate of spending on that, we need to be moving that program as quickly as possible because really it is a race with development. And so it is not a situation where we can wait too long. And so we feel that that has to be a priority. And we feel in terms of the money that is being – you know, we talk about these dollars of several million available in different accounts and so forth, and it is a lot of money, there is no question about it. But on the other hand, just keep in mind, too, that the acquisitions we are doing are also not cheap, and we can do an acquisition that can easily cost \$2 million or \$3 million.

Just the point being that, yes, there is money here, yes, we have taken some time to make the program stronger, the Real Estate Acquisition Program, and I think it is a better program for it. There are many acquisition that are lined up, that are in contract, they are close to accepted offers and so forth. So I just wouldn't want you to be – feel that well, we've got lots of money now, we don't really need to add anything to it.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

No. My point is you are asking for \$20 million, right?

**MR. ISLES:**

We are asking for – for this current capital is 13 million, which is open space, farmland, and affordable housing.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

And there is some carry over from the past, so there is approximately 20 million there. There is 62 million that you can spend that is authorized on the ¼%. So, my question was 82, 60, 70, 80, in the 80, 90 million dollar range, do you have the staff and everything – you are going to be able to do that in a year or two years, three years? How long is the plan?

**MR. ISLES:**

Well, in two years, yes.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

That is what your plan is.

**MR. ISLES:**

We are looking at the rate – we just spent 50 million last year. We are equipped and we are staffed to do that. And here again, in particular with farmland it is important that we proceed now.

I will just make the point, too, that the affordable housing is five million of the amount we are talking about, and that is obviously a little bit of a different program there.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Yes. I would just note that if history is any guide, whenever there are election years, a lot of money is usually spent in this year as well as other areas. I am not at all concerned about the funding being well used. Legislator Foley.

**LEGISLATOR FOLEY:**

Based on those remarks, I will ask a few questions. A non-capital question, but it gets to the heart of the issue of bonding, and particularly of farmland monies. Have we settled on the issue of appraised value for farmland? I know that that has been an issue of late. There were some articles about it. Not to go into any great depth today, but I know that has been an ongoing issue about the methodology that is used to appraise farmland and how that historically has been given as a reason why more farmland has not been preserved, because of say an incorrect methodology has been utilized, where one farm will be appraised at one value and then half a year later another would be twice or three times and that has caused a lot of angst and frustration and outright hostility in some cases. So without spending a lot of time on that, but if you could just – has that been looked at simultaneous with the new funding source to come up with a new way of appraising these properties?

**MR. ISLES:**

Yes, it has been looked at. You're right, it is a hot topic in the farmland community. In fact, we attended, the Real Estate Department, the Planning Department attended a seminar about two weeks ago with the Farm Bureau, with a number of appraisers who lent their expertise to the discussion, as well as representatives from the Town of Southold. We spent a four hour session basically talking about methodology and approaches to determining value. Obviously we want to make fair offers from both sides of the table, and we came away from that with some good information and useful points that we think we can use in future acquisitions.

And just one final point on that. I think it gets back to the issue of timing, which we were just talking about. I think there is a very important point here about negotiations and appraisals and

appraisal reviews becoming stale. So, one of the conclusions of this is to have a process that is methodical but also moves in a steady manner, so we avoid having deals that are hanging out there in an ambiguous status. The property owner then shows up a year later and says well, maybe I want to do it, give me another offer. We have to go out and get another appraisal and so forth. So it is to our interest and I think the protection of farmland to try to move as quickly as possible in a deliberate manner, to consider other approaches to appraisal valuation, including income approach and other, as well the comparable sales approach. So it is something we've dealt with and I think we have gained more information that will help us on that as well.

**LEGISLATOR FOLEY:**

Well, the next regular Environment, Land Acquisition Committee meeting, I am not a member of it, but I am sure that would be a timely topic to go over it so that we can move forward. If the money is there, we want to make sure that the valuations are there in order to move ahead with the acquisitions.

Just several other questions, if I may.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Brian, just on that, for your information, and the other members of the Legislature. Once a month -- we kicked off an initiative in the Town of Riverhead over a year ago to acquire, aggressively acquire, farmland because of the threat of development. We meet monthly. We will be meeting again this Friday. I can tell you the very topic that you brought up, which was right on the mark, is one that has been a hotly debated one in terms of what is farmland worth given development pressures, given the real estate market and so forth. So I am encouraged that the Planning Department and others attended this seminar, and hopefully from that more realistic appraisals will come to pass to make our program more productive.

One more question. I know Legislator Carpenter has a question on this topic. Legislator Carpenter.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

If I could. Before we move off of it I just want to, since I am not on the committee, either, I wanted to take advantage of the opportunity to ask you with the adoption of the reform package that was passed at the Legislature, I had voiced some disagreement with the \$300,000 threshold for the two appraisals, and I know that when Legislator Lindsay and I worked on the Land Review Panel that we felt that the million dollar threshold was more appropriate. Do you feel that this is going to be too cumbersome? Because I am prepared to put a resolution in to, you know, change that, amend it. Thank you.

**MR. ISLES:**

I think we do have some concerns about it, that 300,000 is basically a house these days. It sounds like a lot, but in a certain way it is not a lot of money. I think most importantly, what we appreciate the most, is that there has been the approval of 1388, and it gives us some clarity on which to move forward with. That is a great help to us. To have something that is continuing to change is a concern to us in terms of, as we talked about, the process may take six or eight months, and if rules are changing midstream, it becomes very difficult for us to handle that.

I do think that there may be a need to make some amendments to that resolution, and that might be one of the items. One of the things is the panel, with Legislator Lindsay and yourself on, is that we did make the point that some of these ideas need to be tested as they are

implemented, and maybe we do need to adjust along the way. So we are just trying to find the right point whereby there is adequate fiduciary control without totally jamming up the process, and that certainly from day one has been the real challenge before us.

So, yes, overall I think this has been now at least helpful to have some clear direction. I met with the Real Estate Director for about two hours yesterday on specifically implementing that. But, I would like to reserve the option to do some adjustments if need be for the purpose of making sure that the program can flow and do the job that you and the County Executive want it to do. So in terms of the million dollar threshold, that may be the right thing to do. We are getting two appraisals above 300,000 now, and it may be excessive, but we will do it, obviously, just to keep the program going. But my instinct is that we may want to come back to you and talk to you a little bit further perhaps about that and perhaps about one or two other things. But I would like to actually run it a little while and just see exactly what the problems are then – rather than coming back piecemeal.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

That really makes sense. Perhaps the idea of having a recap after this reform measure has been passed, perhaps that review panel could convene one more time and look at everything after you have been, you know, working through the process a couple of months. I certainly can't speak for Legislator Lindsay or any of the other members of the panel, but I get the sense that after all of the time invested that everyone would be willing to go one more time, review the reforms that have been adopted, see how they are working, perhaps after the summer when we get into the fall and we are starting the operating budget cycle. It might be an appropriate time to make any of those kinds of adjustments.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

So that we can move things right along, I am going to request that Mr. Minei make a brief presentation relating to the various water quality protection programs and the estuary program and whether you have any concerns about this three year proposal sufficiently or insufficiently meeting the demands that you face.

**MR. MINEI:**

Sure. I am Vito Minei. I am Director of Environmental Quality for the Health Department. Just briefly, on behalf of Commissioner Bradley and myself I want to once again thank the County Executive and this Legislature for your continued commitment to what is truly a unique environmental quality program in the United States. I want to personally thank Mary Howe of the Budget Review Office. She has to cut through a lot of rather arcane science to get to the bottom line of the economics.

We have, from the Environmental Quality Division, about eight capital projects before you. In general, we concur with the findings of the Budget Review Office. There is still that lingering concern about this transfer of where to obtain the funds, from bonds to the general or operating funds. We still have that, but basically the eight projects, which cover everything from laboratory equipment and the laboratory space to groundwater monitoring equipment, to brown fields activities and to marine monitoring activities, we are in agreement with the findings of the Budget Review Office.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

In terms of BRO's recommendations, do they differ with those of the presentation?



**MR. MINEI:**

Generally not. Again, the narrative and the bottom line with regard to funding is pretty consistent with our submittals as well.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Okay. Fred, I saw you nodding your head in the negative, so obviously there is some disagreement here.

**MR. POLLERT:**

Not with respect to the need for the projects nor the dollar amounts. The concern that the Budget Review Office has with respect to the equipment is the 5-25-5 law, which requires that the estimated useful life be five years or more. The local finance law equipment life is five years, which means that it doesn't fit underneath the parameters of the ability to bond those projects. The recommendation of the Budget Review Office is that the funds be included in the capital program showing a general fund transfer. That will give you the capability when the budget is approved in November to find out if you have sufficient resources to continue with the 5-25-5 law or whether or not you have to have another one year waiver from the law, at which point you can always change the source of funding. But if you don't change the source of funding in the first instance, you won't be able to bond those projects. So it is important to change the source of funding from bonds to a general fund transfer.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Okay. I would request on my behalf and others who may be so inclined to prepare a budget amendment to that effect. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman Bishop for allowing me to convene this meeting on his behalf, and I will turn it back over to Chairman Bishop or Chairman Fields for a presentation by the Parks Committee. Mr. Bishop.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

Chairwoman Fields, please.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

Thank you. I just want to go back on something that Fred commented on and that I have been very verbal about and had a meeting about. That was the ¼% program and the fact that there was a resolution submitted to have DPW take over that program. The biggest, I guess, problem that I had with that was that some time ago when I put in a resolution about grants I heard the Commissioner comment that he was five years behind in projects and he didn't want to even look for more grants because he couldn't accomplish what he had to do presently and even into the future.

With that in mind, and the comments that you made, Fred, if DPW were to hire a couple of engineers, do you think that they would be able to take over the ¼% program and do some of the water quality projects that have been anticipated that could be done?

**MR. POLLERT:**

It would require the agreement of the Department of Public Works. The Legislature can always add titles to the budget as Legislator Foley has in the past, but it really requires an agreement from the Commissioner of Public Works to make it a priority to, in fact, fill those titles and to properly resource those titles with backup support staff with computers to be able to undertake

the projects. It seems that the Department of Public Works has so many different priorities at this point in time that I would be very hesitant to speak for the department if they would have the capability of even being able to do it even with respect to the infrastructure, to be able to provide the resources to the people if you decide to hire another two or three engineers in that area.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Scully, would you like to present any information to us?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

I would just make some general comments and then I would try to respond to any questions that you might have. I have to echo Mr. Minei's thanks, both to the County Executive and to the Legislature, for the support that they've shown to our capital program in recent years. There are a lot of exciting things going on in the department. Many of you are familiar with those as they apply to your various districts and your interest in those and your support for those are of great assistance to us.

The department also has to express some gratitude to the Budget Review Office because when they assign staff it necessarily involves a great amount of time invested by that staff as well as the County Executive's Budget Office because we need to get them out into the field to show them what the conditions are. It is an important part of the overall effort to become familiar with what we are doing.

We appreciate the BRO comments. There are very few areas of disagreement that we have with them. Some of them are more technical than anything else. One pertains to the project 7099, reconstruction of spillways. The department has a number of parklands which have spillways, dams, or other hard structures in a marine or a freshwater environment, some of which are in need of repair, and we are in the initial stages of assessing those conditions with an eye towards identifying areas where repairs are required and coming back for funding.

The Budget Review analysis points out that we have some funding available and appropriated and I think about \$100,000 in such a project and I just wanted to point out for the benefit of BRO staff and the Legislature that those funds, because of the language contained in the appropriating and bonding resolutions, would need to be expended on a project at the Carmens River, which would constrain somewhat our ability to use those funds.

The issue of our maintenance and operations facilities is a significant dollar issue for BRO – suggesting that we should have an overall plan in place, I guess, prioritized, and that we shouldn't – the Legislature shouldn't authorize additional funding in 2003 for construction. I just wanted to let you know where we are on that project in the general sense.

The project provides funding for maintenance facilities. Generally – we have one nearing completion now at Cedar Point County Park in East Hampton, and will shortly move to begin the restoration of Third House at Theodore Roosevelt County Park in Montauk. One of the issues associated with that is that once that historic structure is renovated, we will lose the use of the basement, which is currently the maintenance facility for the overall park. And we are sensitive to the need to plan carefully out in Montauk because the people on the east end are very, very sensitive about any change whatsoever in the lay of the land. So that planning process is likely to take us some time. We had an initial meeting in Montauk last month to suggest – to gain suggestions from some of the local citizenry about potential locations within the park.

The other maintenance facility, which is top priority for us, is a result of our bringing together or I'd say kind of tightening up the overall capital program at Timber Point Country Club. The golf course project itself has progressed nicely. For those of you who have been to Timber Point lately, and I know several members of the committee have been, the golf pro has told me, you can see that the course itself is coming together. The long-term and big picture view that we are taking at Timber Point, however, leads us to take a look at the need for, over the longer term, a maintenance complex there. As you can see from the capital program, our hope had been to move that to the top of our list and get design work done this year for a low profile and architecturally appropriate maintenance complex at Timber Point.

With those comments having been made, I will try and respond to any questions that you may have.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

There was a comment in the – about Peconic Dunes County Park. I just wondered if you do have some plan regarding either a new licensee there or what you felt about those recommendations from BRO.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

Well, I take the recommendations from BRO to heart, and I also need to thank the County Executive's Office and the Legislature for recognizing the need formally last year when you agreed to appropriate some capital funding for us to begin to address some of the conditions out at Peconic Dunes. It is really a rough jewel, and one that has been from a capital standpoint, I think, neglected for many years. So hopefully we are going to begin to rectify that problem.

The issue of the operating licensee there, I think, has been a difficult one for the department for some years. The last time a request for proposals was issued there was only one respondent, that being Scope, and Scope is operating this year under a single year extension of their license agreement. I chose to exercise the option for one year. They have some concerns about the economic viability of the operation there and the conditions. The issues raised in the BRO report, I think, focus squarely on to what extent is some of the deterioration there a result of a failure of maintenance on the part of the licensee, versus the County's obligation to perform capital improvements.

I am not going to get into that too much, but I will observe that we've thought about and continue to think about actively the potential for an alternative to the current licensee and how that might work in 2003, since we are into the 2002 season, and we recognize based on our conversations with other potential licensee organizations with whom the County and the County Legislature are fully familiar and comfortable. There is a concern on the part of potential licensees that the County show a commitment to begin to invest in infrastructure out there, and I think that the action taken by the Legislature last year was an important step in that direction.

So, to answer your question directly, while I will stop short of saying I wholeheartedly endorse BRO's recommendation, I can't disagree with it, and the issues that it raises about our need to make sure the licensee does the right thing from a maintenance standpoint I think are right on target.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

Thank you. You did answer pretty directly. The other question I have, when you discussed a

little bit about Timber Point, and you and I had a couple of conversations Friday and yesterday about it, the marina there. One of the comments in the report that BRO has given us is that when they are talking about the Timber Point West Project that it still has remaining construction, and the funds initially included for the Timber Point West portion of this project are insufficient for remaining construction needed, therefore, funds are coming out of the Shinnecock portion of the project. What happened there? Is it again the, you know –

**COMM. SCULLY:**

The distinction is between – we have a project that is entitled improvements to County marinas. Because it is broad it gives us a flexibility to address projects at either of the marinas as we see fit. But obviously internal to the project we take a look at dollar amounts and say we would like to restore the bulkhead at Timber Point West. We estimate it is going to cost (x), and we would like to restore or redo the electrical service at Shinnecock, and that is going to cost (y), and we make an overall budget request.

When we get into the more practical reality of implementing a project, the actual costs become clear to us, and very often we will have to say you know what? We need to get this job completed. Our initial cost estimate was less than what turns out to be the real cost, and we are going to have to defer a portion of the improvements at Shinnecock. That is not unusual.

The reason that I am at a little bit of a disadvantage with respect to the precise cost of the existing contract obviously is because under the Charter the contract was let and the project is being administered by the Department of Public Works. We do have some additional work to do at Timber Point west, both short-term and medium-term.

We are in the process now of installing water service there. You and I spoke about this yesterday. The contractor will be there on Thursday to begin that process. And we are also in the process of relocating electrical service there, which I don't believe was contemplated as part of the original project. We were talking about a bulkhead replacement, but it became clear during the course of the project that it would really make a lot of sense to relocate the wires and the poles that carry them from the area of the boardwalk to the east, to the other side of the roadway. That is necessarily a cost of the project, but wasn't originally contemplated as part of it. That is probably what we are talking about here.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

All right. I just want to be a little more clear on the process. You said that you initially thought it would cost (x) to do a project. I mean, this is for any project. And then DPW got the project and did it and it ended up being more. Is DPW the group that gets the analysis of the cost or the cost estimate and then gives it to you, or do you go and get it and think that is what it is and then DPW gets the work? How does that process work? And one more. Was this estimate from let's say three years ago as we talked about before, or as Fred talked about before, where projects are agreed upon and then not done for several years and then the cost is higher.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

In the case of the Timber Point bulkhead I think that those cost estimates are fairly recent. I think we began talking about it when I became Commissioner, so late 2000. And at a project like that, I will stand corrected if I am wrong, but it is basically a per foot. It is going to cost us this much per foot, linear foot, of bulkhead restoration, and so they do a pretty good job on that. I think that the issue in this case was that there were costs we didn't see. It wasn't that the project as we originally scoped it came in far, far above what was anticipated, but there were



ancillary costs, like the relocation of the electrical service and things of that nature that weren't really part of the project in the – as originally scoped, but then when we took a look at it, we said it really makes sense to move this as long as we are doing that. We are going to end up with a better marina, and that is why we made the decision, you know what, it is going to cost us a little bit more money to do this, but we might as well do this and do it right. We are going to end up with more electrical service for the people in the marina. It is not going to look as cluttered. It is a good idea to do this. Let's make the investment even though it is going to have the impact of not allowing us to move forward as rapidly on some of the things we want to get done at Shinnecock. So those are conscious, in this instance, at least, this was a conscious decision that we made to go ahead and invest in something that was really an add-on to the project because it makes a lot of sense.

There is more to be done at Timber Point, however. The big picture with the marinas, both of which are looking good now, and the golf course coming together, we need to make sure that when this golf course is done, and we are hopeful that next June we are going to have sort of a celebratory re-opening of the golf course, we'd like everything there to look like it's a new place, and that includes pavement, which wasn't included in the original capital project, and the historic house, which is the clubhouse itself. So we have some more work to do.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

Is the paving in this next year coming up or it hasn't been authorized.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

No, the paving hasn't been authorized. Initially we had been a little bit concerned that restoration of the pavement in the area of the marina hadn't been included in the construction project, but in retrospect that turns out to have been a very prudent thing for DPW to do. The reason being, and we have a tremendous amount of heavy truck traffic over there in conjunction with the golf course project, and had we repaved it only to have it subject to this heavy truck traffic, that would have suffered damage very, very quickly. So, we are pleased about that. But the short-term implications are that it doesn't look as good as it might, and we have some drainage issues in the vicinity of the west marina that need to be engineered as part of the paving project. So those are some of the concerns some of the folks who are using the marina having been voicing to us.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

When do you plan on paving it, then? Or when would you like to see that completed?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

I am going to be meeting with my golf course staff within the next few days. I'm trying to lay out an overall schedule for Timber Point that gets me where I want to be in June, 2003. So either in the fall or in the spring, and I will try to have an answer for you by the next committee meeting.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

And when you need to do that you will need to look for some other source to put the money in there, or you need it now to be placed in the budget?

**MR. SCULLY:**

Well, because of the way the budget process works, in all likelihood we would be coming and looking for an offset, either to appropriate funding we originally intended for another project, or



to find another source for an offset. And we recognize that in doing so we need to come and make a good justification to this Legislature. But the Timber Point project I think is one that when it is said and done, we want it to be something that everybody can be very, very proud of.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

Okay. Thank you.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Fred, in the omnibus, is the funding for the planning steps for the maintenance facility, has that been cut out or is that still included?

**MR. POLLERT:**

No, that has not been cut out. The committee has only met one time, though.

**LEGISLATOR FOLEY:**

I missed that question.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

The funding for planning steps for the maintenance facility for Timber Point. Could you just prepare a stand alone for me, then, just in case it gets cut out?

**MR. POLLERT:**

To keep the funding in?

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Right.

**MR. POLLERT:**

That wouldn't really be required. All you would have to do is just take out that portion of a resolution that –

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

The omnibus is going to be an all or nothing thing, right?

**MR. POLLERT:**

That is correct.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Right. And it is real hard to amend an omnibus. If they've cut that funding out it would be almost impossible for me to just like get one line put back in there.

**MR. POLLERT:**

Right, but the other difficulty is you can't have a stand alone resolution because you can't have a resolution that conflicts with the omnibus. So if the omnibus action would be to remove funding, you can't have a stand alone resolution which conflicts with the previous resolution. So, what the important point would be is just to make sure this is not included in omnibus, or if it is included in the omnibus resolution, to make a motion to take out that portion of the omnibus.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

All right, because I am not on the Omnibus Committee again this year. All right. Thanks, Fred.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Commissioner, just reviewing some of these projects, I just don't know how you keep all these balls in the air and do everything. But I have a question about Coindre Hall. In reviewing Budget Review's report, I see that the boathouse area is highlighted and that a comment was made that the waterfront area continues to be used by the Sagamore Rowing Club in exchange for improvements to the boathouse area. My question is what kind of improvements are they doing, what is the value of these improvements, is this in lieu of rent or in addition to any rent that they are paying?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

The West Neck Farm/Coindre Hall Complex is one that is managed for us by Friends For Long Island's Heritage. The agreement, under which Sagamore uses the boathouse, is between Friends For Long Island's Heritage and Sagamore and it requires that they invest a very modest amount, I think \$10,000, over every three years towards maintenance and improvements to the boathouse. So on the face of it I think that the public benefit or the benefit to the people that use the boathouse, I mean the youth and other clubs, was probably seen as significant. As a result of that, the need for them to make really substantive improvements to the boathouse was probably not something as seen that should nor was appropriate to require.

I just want to make real brief comments about that project generally. You mentioned the many balls that we have in the air. I have to tell you that as much as I would like to take credit, I think that really credit needs to go to the Department of Public Works and the people who provide staff support for our capital program. As I told Mr. Pollert when I arrived today, I really could keep the Department of Public Works staff employed full-time doing just our capital program. That is a real strain because they are doing a million things.

In the case of the boathouse, they have really been of great assistance to us over the past few months. You know there was a point in time when the Fire Marshal and our security director took a look at the place and said you know what? We are really not too comfortable having groups using this house. We had a series of what were really emergency meetings where, with the help of the County Architect, they reached agreement on a series of emergency measures to eliminate some of the safety concerns that had been identified to get the people back in the boathouse.

The big picture with the boathouse is that we have an architect on-board doing plans for a restoration, but we have come to realize over the past six months that an ice pond that was used by the folks who inhabited the West Neck Farm Mansion for ice supply and had a series of valves allowing them to regulate how much water went into the area, this ice pond near the boathouse, that valving system has deteriorated to the point where it is non-functional, and the area in and around this boathouse, which is a tremendous structure – for those of you who have seen it understand. It is stone construction and very, very heavy. The ground in and around it has liquefied. I think our concern has been that it might compromise the overall integrity of the boathouse, and indeed the one improvement that Sagamore Rowing was able to cite for me that they made over the past couple of years, was the installation of plywood flooring. The reason it was necessary is because the building itself, now sitting upon this liquefied area, has settled somewhat and the floor is shifting.

So right now the Department of Public Works has scrambled to bring in a contractor to help us

deal with this liquefaction and watering problem in and around the base of the boathouse. It seems to me, I am not an engineer, but it seems fairly obvious to me that we really need to get that problem under control before we can size up what our next steps will be in the restoration. So, we are thankful for that.

BRO also points out that there is a seawall on the west side of the boathouse that is leaning and is in danger of collapse. It is my assumption that it is also a result of the same problem with the water problem down there. So hopefully over the next couple of months we will see the progress that we hope to see in terms of restoration of this valving system that allows us to regulate water in and around the boathouse. To dry that place up is the first step towards long-term stabilization of the boathouse.

I think that we have kind of resolved that coming back every couple of years to take a look at the condition there as we plan for the improvements is not something we want to do. We would really like to get a handle on the water problem, clarify what the restoration process is going to be and what the cost is going to be, and just get the boathouse done so we can have a level of comfort that the people who are using it are not in any danger whatsoever and that we can say that we've made a significant investment with a well thought out plan and have a result that everybody can be proud of.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Budget Review has made the comment that a comprehensive plan for the overall site restoration should be something that is required, and also sites that there are many problems associated with the utilization of the boathouse, its limited accessibility and lack of sanitary facilities. Usage should be reviewed as a major risk as the work is being undertaken. Now, Friends of – I mean, the Sagamore Rowing Club, is that the only group that is using the facility?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

No. Sagamore has an agreement with Friends to utilize it and they allow utilization of the boathouse by a number of other high school groups. There was a point in time in which an inquiry was made, I think by your office, who wanted to know more about it. I do have an accounting of both – identity of all the groups utilizing and what the cost of those groups is for the use of the building. But there are a number of groups who are utilizing it.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

So do they pay rent to Sagamore, then, to use it or some sort of fee?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

Yes, they pay fees and it is more than just rent because what Sagamore collects from them are the costs that Sagamore bears for the participation by those various groups and a number of activities and/or tournaments. I had to have that explained to me and I had to request a couple of times an accounting, but I finally did receive that.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

I would ask, if you could, to get that out and share it with the committee, because it seems to me that if they've got an agreement for three years for \$10,000 worth of repairs, that translates to \$3,300 a year in cost to them. But if they in turn are charging groups to use the facility, they may very well be making a profit. I think we need to know that, need to know who is really using that, and have, perhaps, a little bit more accountability on the facility, especially when we are looking at the kinds of dollars that have been committed here to date and what is looking to

be committed in the future.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

I will make sure to pass that information along very promptly.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

You said, though, that the Friends group oversees that? Sagamore deals with Friends?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

That is correct.

**CHAIRMAN FIELDS:**

So, you and I also had this conversation. Perhaps in the Parks Committee we could see all of the groups that contract with Friends or that deal with Friends so that we can see what it is that they are overseeing, how much they are making, and maybe we could even have them come here and give us an analysis of everything that they do before we see that in Newsday also. Legislator Foley.

**LEGISLATOR FOLEY:**

Thank you, Madam Chair. Peter, do you know when we will see some movement with the Maritime Museum and some of the projects, capital improvements, that have been slated for that building?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

Yes. Well, let me answer your question by saying no, we don't know when we will see movement. We have at long last begun to expend some of the capital funds that were provided by the Legislature. Unfortunately, they have been expended to remediate potentially hazardous conditions. We had an asbestos removal project in the – at the museum, and with an eye towards preparing it for long-term improvements.

The Director and the Chairman of the Board of Trustees appeared at CEQ, I think, last month in the hope of having an overall plan approved and having an individual project approved there, but they weren't successful in getting CEQ to approve it because they didn't have enough information with them.

**LEGISLATOR FOLEY:**

They have developed their master plan, though, correct? I mean, that was the constructive criticism that the BRO had for a number of years, that there wasn't a master plan on the building, what they intended to do. They've put forward the master plan for the building, is that –

**COMM. SCULLY:**

Right. That was one of the items on the CEQ agenda. I was not present at the CEQ meeting, but my understanding is that some of the members of CEQ requested information that the museum wasn't able to provide. The balance in that account is around \$200,000. I think that we have a prioritized list of projects, but as with so many of the historic structures, once you start getting into them, you realize that they are a little bit more substantive or a little bit more complicated than originally hoped. We had hoped in that case, I think, to replace some stucco on a chimney there and brought in an expert to take a look at that, only to come to understand that the chimney itself needs to be rebuilt.

I think that the big picture for the Maritime Museum is that a long-term plan is going to require a significant fundraising on the part of the Board of Trustees. They are now working with a professional fundraiser and they haven't retained the person yet, but they are looking to do that. They have new additions to the Board of Trustees –

**LEGISLATOR FOLEY:**

Is it a professional grant writer?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

No. I think that this person is a fundraiser.

**LEGISLATOR FOLEY:**

Very good. Okay. We are not asking that board to do anything more than we are asking the Vanderbilt Board to do as far as fundraising, are we, given the different demographics of the County?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

I am not so familiar with what is going on at the Vanderbilt, although I have stood back with amazement and watched some of the improvements there over the last few years. That is the type of result that we would like to see at Maritime.

**LEGISLATOR FOLEY:**

If I may just move along the south shore to another project further east at Smith Point.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

May I just ask –

**LEGISLATOR FOLEY:**

Back on Maritime?

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Yes.

**LEGISLATOR FOLEY:**

Okay. We'll stay in Islip for a moment.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Thank you. Do you know how many members are on that board?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

No, off of the top of my head I don't. Approximately a dozen I am thinking.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

And is that set by – I mean, is that number of trustees set by the County or by the museum itself?

**COMM. SCULLY:**



My recollection is that the trustees have a lot of latitude and have undertaken appointments of additional trustees when they see that it is appropriate. I will have to check the Charter to be sure, Legislator Carpenter, but I think that the one thing it says is that the Commissioner serves as one of the trustees and that the Presiding Officer or the Chairman of the Parks Committee serves, but I don't think it is specific as to number. I will check that right away when I get –

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

If you could, and perhaps that is an area that we could look at, expanding the number of trustees to try to bring some people in who could help with the fundraising as members of the board.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

My observation is that over the past few years they really do have some personalities on that board, Councilman Bodkin among them, who seem to me are the right type of people you want to send out.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

He was one of the legislative appointments.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

That was a good appointment. He just seems to be the type of person who has got big visions and likes to travel to Albany and Washington searching for the golden ring.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Exactly, and that is exactly what it needs. But if we can broaden that base of people who have that kind of like thinking I think it will really benefit the museum and the County has a whole.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

I think they are doing a very, very strong job on program. I think that from the standpoint of the business acumen of the staff and capability they could use some support.

**LEGISLATOR CARPENTER:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

I have one final question, and Legislator Foley touched upon it. We did look to have a grant writer in the Parks Department, and I would like to know how close we are to actually putting a body in that position and having that person work to look for grants for the Parks Department.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

As far as I have gone this year has to been to request a Civil Service list and see what kinds of candidates are on the list. Because of budgetary constraints and need to achieve turnover savings, each operating department was required to submit to the County Executive's Office a hiring plan which placed priorities on positions. And I will be honest, I had placed a lesser priority on that appointment only because I had no place at the time I completed the hiring plan, had no place to locate that individual. You and I have subsequently had conversations about your willingness to make office space available to the department should we decide to move

forward and make that appointment. Bottom line being that under the hiring plan we submitted to the County Executive's Office, we didn't propose to appoint anybody until very, very late in the year so that we could meet our turnover savings target. And I would have to go back and check what effective date of appointment we suggested, so.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

Well, if you are talking about turnover savings, I think that hiring a grant writer who could bring money into the department would certainly fill that void by getting more money into the department. There are lots of places where they can get historic money and other kinds of money. I would ask you to make that one of your thousand priorities and see if you can hire someone as rapidly as we can get them in there, and again, I will offer a spare room in my office if it is a question of where to put the person, because I think it is that important that we get someone that can bring more money into this department.

**LEGISLATOR FOLEY:**

If I could reclaim my time, Madam Chair.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

I am very sorry.

**LEGISLATOR FOLEY:**

Thank you. Just for a moment, Commissioner, if we could move a little eastward to Smith Point Park. You read, obviously, the review of BRO and your thoughts and comments on that. Just let the record reflect that as the Legislator representing the area I and the department and other Legislators will in the near future be meeting again with the consultants, and by the end of the year a master plan should be developed. But, Peter, if you could just tell the committee where things stand right now, in your response, if you will, to BRO's report.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

I think that they are absolutely right that the most urgent matter we face out there is really the erosion issue and how it is going to be addressed long-term because obviously the County has no control over the forces of nature or the efforts by the federal government and State government to address erosion along the barrier beach. That concern, and the fact that the centerpiece of that whole site is the pavilion and the question of whether or not it is a prudent thing for us to do, to rebuild it in its current footprint, is the reason that I really pushed for an update to the master plan. I don't think that the 1997 master plan really did an adequate job of raising that as an issue and saying we have a policy decision to make here. Hopefully by later this year we will be in a position to make what will likely be a very, very difficult decision about precisely that issue.

It seems to me that in terms of an implementation of a master plan for that park, everything else flows from that. I mean, the center of that park will be whatever replacement pavilion or refurbished pavilion sits there, and all the ancillary facilities, the operations building and all that sort of thing, the location and scope of those will be dictated by what we do with the pavilion. So I think that from that standpoint I have to say that we agree and that the suggestion that future appropriations should be made based upon the findings in the master plan, I think that logic speaks for itself. I am hopeful that over the next few months we will have an opportunity – I know that the park itself is in your district. I know there is another Legislator who represents the district across the water who has got a great interest in it as well, so I am looking forward to exploring with both of you what potential might be out there to get some focused attention from

the federal government in terms of addressing the offshore problems and the erosion problems, which experts tell me are largely over the long-term a result of the lack of any resolution to the big picture as it relates to the barrier beach. Acknowledging, though, to be fair, that the series of storms that we experienced in the early 1990's had a real impact on Smith Point and kind of accelerated the erosion process.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

Peter, I apologize if I am being redundant, but I did have a question regarding the organic maintenance program and the interpretive center and the timetable for actually siting that facility. It has been now four years since the voter referendum. What is the status of that?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

The Legislature last year enacted a bill extending the timetable for the process and kind of reconfiguring the committee that had been doing the work selecting the site. They have met, I think, on three occasions and short listed some sites and asked the Department of Public Works, and I think it was wise, or had us ask the Department of Public Works a series of questions about the suitability of the sites that they were looking at from the standpoint of access, road access, and utilities – public water, electric, and things of that nature.

We are at the point now where we are ready to reconvene that committee. We met with Judy Gordon, who oversees that process for me, yesterday morning, as a matter of fact. We are in a process of reconvening that committee with an eye towards giving them that information in the hope that we can get a recommendation to the County Executive and the Legislature this fall.

I think it has long been recognized that the facility that it appears was envisioned by the Legislature is very specific Charter language detailing what the features should be. It is likely to require more resources than were provided in the referendum, and that may be challenged, that we are going to need to confront together as a government. But the recommendation on the site, I think, you will probably see in the fall.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

What sites are under consideration?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

The sites that they are actively considering at the present time are Southaven County Park, Robert Cushman Murphy County Park. I think there is a third site. Smithers was still on the short list of sites.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

Clearly Smithers would require a major infusion of capital program funding to rehabilitate the structures there that are probably better suited for demolition than reconstruction or rehabilitation. What about Peconic Dunes?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

We have the benefit, or the committee had the benefit of a site visit and a presentation at Peconic Dunes hosted by Mr. {Hilari}. I can't speak for the committee, obviously, but I think that they had some real concerns about the geographic location and access.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

Elaborate on access, because it is right off a major County road.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

I mean the accessibility for residents of the County overall, geography more than roadway.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

What is envisioned in terms of access to the center for the public and the school children? Obviously school children have bus transportation so there is no access issue. For County residents it would be if the center lives up to the expectations I and others had who proposed that legislation, there shouldn't be an issue. You have infrastructure there. You have some new facilities, you have public water. You have a lot of what is needed that we would have to go build someplace else. Are there facilities at Southaven or are you talking about setting aside a portion of the park and creating the facilities? I mean, at this point, share with us some of the concepts that are kicking around.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

Okay. The first thing I really need to do to make the discussion meaningful is to make clear to you that perhaps unlike my predecessor, I haven't sought to steer the committee in any direction, and that many of the questions that you are asking me are questions that you might get a more informed answer from the members of the committee in terms of how they reached the point that they did in their deliberations.

I think that my recollection is that with respect to Southaven, there were several different things that were said about the potential for the use of the large room in the lodge as an auditorium type of facility, but the real attraction to the park generally was that it was centrally located and directly accessible from Sunrise Highway, and in the Pine Barrens core, and had existing roadway and parkway infrastructure. I think those are some of the features that the committee found attractive.

I am not here to defend their short list to you, not to press for any one of the sites over the others. There were other sites I thought had potential viability that they summarily dismissed. My role is not to point them and push them, but to try and provide information and allow them to deliberate.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

Were either of the County parks along County Road 21 in Middle Island considered, Cathedral and {Proser} Pines?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

{Proser} Pines I think the answer is no because it is a nature preserve. The Cathedral Pines facility was briefly discussed but dismissed as not viable.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

When does this committee meet again?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

I don't have a date yet.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

I would appreciate you notifying me of that because I would like to address the committee, but understanding of where they are going with this.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

May I interrupt? Could you also let me now the date of that meeting?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

I will advise the committee.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

Thank you.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

The organic maintenance program and equipment, again, that has been pushed back waiting for the science to catch up. When do we anticipate that will actually take place now?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

The effect of what we commonly refer to as the Bishop Bill was pushed back 18 months, so I think that that gives us until July of 2003, if I may not mistaken.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

It is not that far off.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

And we do have some concerns about that. We had proposed in response to a solicitation from the Planning Department the use of Water Protection Fund monies to cover some of those costs we felt we could tie directly to the Water Protection Fund. I think that the County Executive's recommended 2002 Operating Budget would have provided some funding out of fund 477 for that purpose.

During the budget process those funds were amended out and the rationale was that the deadline had been pushed back and that the funding wouldn't be required. And I understand that logic, but I just wanted to make clear that the real challenge there is not that we need to change on the date that the prohibition becomes effective, but that we need to spend every day until that prohibition becomes effective preparing for that, getting the training, getting the equipment, get the personnel necessary. You guys – both you and Legislator Alden are familiar that we had the USGA in to take a look at our courses, the way they are staffed and operated, and one of their conclusions was that we really couldn't expect to operate the courses at current staffing level.

The point I was leading to is that we have recently been discussing with the County Executive's Office the possibility of coming back to the Legislature and saying, look, we amend the – that money was amended, that funding was amended out of the 2002 Operating Budget, but here are reasons why we think it makes sense to begin this process now and our hope had been to begin talking to Legislators about the possibility of amending the budget to return that funding so that we can continue to prepare.

I have a little task list of priorities that I keep on my palm pilot, and after this meeting today I do have a meeting at Timber Point, but I am hopeful that when we put some presentation materials together to bring to you to make an argument which we feel justifies the use of those monies for that purpose.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

Aside from seasonals, how many full-time employees do we have at each of the County courses



as of today?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

I am sorry. I would need to make a phone call to be precise about that.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

Would it be fair to say five?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

Five to seven.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

And what typically is found at other public fee courses?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

I don't have the answer to that question, but I do know off the top of my head that the USGA recommended that we needed a minimum of 12 to 15 at an 18 hole course.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

How many of the positions that are in this year's operating budget for park personnel are unfilled positions?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

At present I have about half dozen unfilled, but none of those are golf course positions other than one. I have one unfilled AEO from Indian Island.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

Okay. But in the context of the organic maintenance program and department needs, both equipment, training, and personnel as you cited, there is clearly a clear-cut need for additional personnel. Will you be making a recommendation to the Legislature for the 2003 operating budget for the inclusion of additional personnel specific to the golf courses?

**COMM. SCULLY:**

Yes, but I think that you are likely to see in the coming weeks that with the support of the County Executive's Office I will be asking that we not wait until 2003 to get those people on board.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

You know I have been a long time advocate of more personnel on the courses. The public fees that we charge are not inexpensive any longer, and good groomed golf courses is what the public deserves. It is one of the few benefits County taxpayers get for their tax dollars outside of public safety.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

We appreciate the scrutiny and the support, and I think that one of the things that you said to me when I first came before the committee was that you don't mind being supportive, but you like to see results. I think that if you look at the way the courses look, particularly at Indian Island and West Sayville, you can see that we have been working hard to try and earn your confidence and your trust and to improve things there. One of the projects that we've requested in the 2003 capital program is the additional of the 19<sup>th</sup> hole, where, with your help we were

able to eliminate those Quonset huts. So, we appreciate the support of the Legislature for efforts to get the golf courses back on track. And with those new irrigation systems in place, I think we have gone a long way.

The real challenge, however, becomes now that you have these computerized, these highly technical systems, you need the folks and the technically qualified people to operate those. So, we need to be real careful about the type of personnel that we use.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

I have two other quick areas I want to touch on. One, Vito, deals with the pilot program that we began talking about a long time ago at Indian Island County Park with respect to tying into the Riverhead Sewage Treatment Plant and possibly a pilot program. The last time you and I talked about it, it was pending the possibility of some federal or State grant funding. What can you update us on with respect to that?

**MR. MINEI:**

I can tell you that we made an application to the United States Environmental Protection Agency to try to secure federal funds for spray irrigation was really the pilot study, using the effluent from the Riverhead Town sewage facility with the cooperation of the Parks Department on Indian Island. That application was denied.

There is a pending application by the town that we helped advance with regard to the Clean Water/Clean Air Bond Act for the entire cost of what would be entailed to actually implement the spray irrigation of the effluent with a pilot study up front. I believe that is still pending.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

Do you know when they expect to hear?

**MR. MINEI:**

I can check into that. I really don't know off-hand.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

Okay. If we were to undertake the study ourselves, what would be necessary in terms of capital program and budget?

**MR. MINEI:**

Well, the capital program was pretty extensive. I thought it entailed a couple of million dollars of connecting into the irrigation system. The pilot study was on the order of 50 to \$150,000.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

I am speaking now specific to the pilot study.

**MR. MINEI:**

Probably at the upper end of about 150,000.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:**

Is that something you would support?

**MR. MINEI:**

Absolutely. We still have some lingering concerns about the utilization of sewage effluent on a

public access facility. There is information that is starting to creep in, even though it is done elsewhere around the country, about some reservations about the approach.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

Okay. So do you think it would be cost effective for us to consider a \$50,000 pilot program study under the capital program?

**MR. MINEI:**

Well, if you would hold that in reserve until I get you an answer on where we stand with –

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

We only have until Friday to file a resolution.

**MR. MINEI:**

Well, I can find out this afternoon.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

We are losing members and some people have to leave and we would like to get to the Vanderbilt.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

Just before we do, Madam Chair, I have one final, and that deals with the visit by the Parks Commissioner out to the site of a home that was once used, we are not certain on what type of basis, by Helen Keller, but there is apparently a home on County property and I don't know if Lance Mallamo has been there. I know the Commissioner has. Peter, could you just share with us you view as to – there is a write-up on it in the BRO report, so if you could just summarize where you think the County should go regarding that project.

**COMM. SCULLY:**

Real briefly, for those of you who aren't familiar with it. Cedar Beach County Park juts out into the Peconic at the Town of Southold and there is a marine lab there formerly operated by Suffolk Community College and now operated by Cornell Cooperative Extension. There is also a house just east of the lab facility that was used by Suffolk Community College for storage purposes. They had, while they were still tenants of the marine lab, discontinued their use of that house. I think they expressed concerns about the safety of continuing the use. That home continued to deteriorate, and in 1987, I guess, it was looked at by Friends for Long Island's Heritage with an eye towards including it in their landmark preservation program. They indicated at that time, I am told, that they didn't have resources to accomplish a restoration.

When I became Commissioner in the year 2000, the Town of Southold contacted our department and urged us to demolish the structure because it was unsafe and in their view presented a liability concern. Given the status of the structure the issue was taken to Council on Environmental Quality, which voted in July of 2000, to authorize the demolition. We had not gotten around to that by early this year when we became aware that a resident of Mattituck was talking about generating grants and private donations sufficient to undertake a restoration of the house. We have had some contact with her and are awaiting now, we will be sending her a letter today, awaiting some sort of formal presentation from her on what her plans would be to generate the funds required to undertake a restoration.

The condition of the house is such that I was describing to Legislator Caracciolo by phone last week and he, not I, likened it to a Hollywood set, and I would have to say that is an appropriate description, because from the front it looks fairly solid, but when you walk around to the back you will see that the house is entirely open and there is a toilet on the second floor hanging in mid-air and it is not a safe condition.

Bottom line we are waiting. It is difficult not to be receptive to expressions of interest from citizens who indicate a willingness to undertake the gargantuan task of massing resources to do a restoration, but it remains to be seen how much thought has gone into that proposal and how realistic it is, and hopefully we will find out within the coming weeks whether or not these well intentioned folks have a good understanding of what it would take to get that house restored.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

Is it clear to us that this home was occupied and used as a permanent residence by Helen Keller or – what was the relationship?

**MR. SCULLY:**

I'm sorry, I don't have my file, but my clear recollection is that she summered there one summer for several weeks.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

So it wasn't a long-term relationship, it was just one summer. So it would be somewhat of a misnomer to call this the Helen Keller house. Lance, you are the historian. Just quickly.

**MR. MALLAMO:**

It is my understanding she summered there for two weeks. She rented the building from {Honie Madden}, who owned the Cotton Club. He was the owner at the time. What was significant about the property is it was at that location that Annie Sullivan, her caretaker, had a heart attack that ultimately led to her death about a week later. So, it was a major turning point in her life. Ten years ago I did advocate to preserve the house, but I think right now it is beyond all hope.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

Thank you. Vanderbilt.

**MR. MALLAMO:**

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I appreciate the opportunity –

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

We are now at good afternoon.

**MR. MALLAMO:**

Can you give me an idea how much time we have this morning?

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

About 60 seconds. I believe the next meeting should start now. The next meeting should have started now.

**MR. MALLAMO:**

I had a number of comments I wanted to make. I will try and be as brief as I can. Generally I agree with the outline that is presented here by BRO and I would like to thank both the County Executive's Budget Office and the BRO staff for the time that they took to look at our capital project issue. I know there is a concern expressed throughout about the lag time of many of these projects. I am happy to report that as of the past two weeks we have let almost eight million dollars in contracts and work is happening on a number of these that had been delayed.

I will fault myself. I am at the museum four years, and when I came four years ago there were three major projects that had been – the planning had been completed and it was awaiting the director's approval. It was at that point that I stepped in and I did not approve those projects because I thought the destructive potential on the building far outweighed the benefit. So I asked DPW to re-plan the projects and that has been done. That was a major factor of the delay there, the HVAC, the electric and the plumbing, but I think we will be much happier with the result than what would have occurred had we spent the money.

Several of the comments made last year is that the museum look at getting someone on-staff to handle capital projects. To date I have done that directly, and I have divided my duties between the museum director and overseeing these projects. We have added a new director of operations for the museum, and it is my intention next week to discuss with our personnel committee giving responsibility for a large part of the capital project initiatives to that individual. I have been training him for the past year. We have also hired a new director of development, who has a Masters Degree in historic preservation and spends – right now has over 15 grants done in the past six months for different historic preservation projects. So, this is not someone who is learning the trade on the job. He is absolutely up and running.

I will note in here in two locations it says we are going to be applying for a Clean Air/Clean Water Bond Act grant. Unfortunately, I went to a workshop and counties are not eligible to apply in that category. We must partner with a municipal entity. So, we are going to be changing the scope of our request and applying through the Environmental Protection Fund, which we can apply in, and we will be directing those funds not specifically for in the case I am looking at right here, the ramp in front of the seaplane hangar. We are going to be asking for the glass window in the seaplane hangar because State staff felt that that was something that they would be more logical to fund, and then we will use the funds we had reserved for that for the seaplane hangar.

If I could go through quickly each project. 7427, the Rogers waterfront is on schedule. Mr. Rogers, who is 85, is very impatient to see the seaplane hangar finished, but he has followed through with his donations. Right now we have collected about \$160,000 of his first year's donation of \$200,000. Last year with a portion of his money we set up an exhibit at New York Institute of Technology in Central Islip. This year we are moving that exhibit. In fact, it is being set up as we speak, to the museum site behind the planetarium. If we have a problem with our {Goto} projector that will be our plan B for a new exhibit area at the museum. And if we don't have a problem with the planetarium projector I am hoping that we will have a significant pool of new operating income.

The 7428, restoration of the seaplane hangar. Preliminary design work has been done by an architect to confirm that our concept for the building was going to work and we are awaiting the



selection of an architect by DPW. Just so you are familiar, and I know you are familiar with how the process works, but we are the client. We tell DPW what we want and it is their job to implement it. So, we are just waiting for them to make that decision.

The Normandy Manor acquisition, I understand the contracts were signed two weeks ago and we are just waiting for the closing on that. Restoration of the seawall, that contract has been awarded and work is to start this summer. We are having a kick-off meeting tomorrow on that project in fact.

Restoration of driveways, gutters, catch basins and walkways. I know there was concern on BRO's part that a priority list of projects has not been identified. I know we had such a list because I worked that up with DPW. I can tell you off the top of my head my priority is to get all the parking areas and asphalt roadways repaved. They are in deplorable condition. We have huge craters in the parking lot because of the increase in educational programming with school buses and capital project truck deliveries. These parking lots have taken a tremendous burden that they weren't designed to take, and we do need that work done.

Also, the museum bridge, as indicated here, is a very high priority that needs major engineering work done on it by DPW, and I know they have discussed many different ways to do it, but as far as I know, no contract has been let to do that design work.

Also, with the restoration of the seaplane hangar project, we know we are going to have to repave and widen the road to the seaplane hangar as that project proceeds.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

You know, Lance, maybe – could I just ask a question that Legislator Carpenter wanted asked because we are losing people and I think I just want to get to the bottom line.

**MR. MALLAMO:**

Sure.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

On page 470 it says that, "Recently the museum made arrangements to erect a temporary building behind the planetarium for additional exhibit space without consulting with DPW. They are also considering cutting a door in the back wall of the planetarium for additional access to the temporary building." It goes on to say that, "The museum must consult with the County architect at the conceptual stages for any building modifications. For example, the erection of a temporary building behind the planetarium. DPW should also be consulted regarding utilization of space in the planetarium to determine if existing office space can safely accommodate school classes, etceteras." And then it also goes on to say that, "BRO recommends that the museum routinely consult with the County Architect before privately paying contractors and architects to assess modifications to building structures. The Vanderbilt Museum is a County facility and as such building matters should be assessed with the expertise and assistance of DPW."

It just seems that, you know -- there is an addition. "BRO was unable to obtain a priority list of projects with estimated costs from either the museum or DPW. While we agree with the funding proposed for 2003, we recommend that no funds be appropriated until a more detailed work plan is submitted to the Legislature for review." And it goes on.

I think these are, you know, really large red flags that you have to respond to.

**MR. MALLAMO:**

It certainly appears to be a red flag, Legislator Fields. Let me just describe, if I can take a few minutes to talk about the temporary building. It was not our understanding, and I accept responsibility for not being aware of that, that we required a building permit. We had discussed with DPW, because we had to relocate an oil tank behind the planetarium, and it was actually that need to accommodate this new building that led us to communicate with KeySpan that ultimately we were able to redesign the whole HVAC project to change the property to natural gas, which we had been hoping to do all along.

We had worked with the County Fire Marshal. I had actually brought it to the Legislature and CEQ for review and they actually passed a resolution authorizing the temporary building. What I realized from DPW as part of the capital budget process, they said you know, you really need a building permit for that. I was under the impression the County exempt from giving permits. Now I understand we have to have a permit for everything, that the County itself issues them.

So, DPW has been out there, they have looked at the building, we have all the specs from the manufacturer. They are going to determine where the opening in this door will be. So, DPW is totally up to speed on that and is making those arrangements, as they have been where we are talking about adding classroom and food service areas, we have asked them to do that, too. We had, well before that, involved the Suffolk County Fire Marshal in determining the fire needs. We do that routinely with everything we do. It is my understanding he puts his input with the County Architect. But we have certainly clarified our responsibilities with regard to that.

Talking about the need for bringing in an outside architect, we have done that in only one case. That involves the boathouse, and the architect that was brought in, who was the architect who had designed the restoration project for the boathouse, and we really needed an answer from him whether this was something that could be done. We are using this building currently and we wanted to expedite this as much as we could. No work has begun on that project. We just brought it in, the architect, to look at what was there, but he has not started the project nor will he do so until he is in communication with DPW on that. I know it sounds like we are doing this all the time. Actually that is not totally accurate.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

I think what I would like to do in the Parks Committee meeting is ask that in maybe two or three months from now that you come to the Parks Department with that kind of a plan that tells us exactly what it is that you have in mind. I mean, there is talk about buying drapes before the rest of the plan is done. I mean, there are a lot of things that I think we can't really even address.

**MR. MALLAMO:**

Certainly. I know we had talked about coming to the committee about our endowment in about two months. If you remember back in April we talked about that.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

Yeah, right. We wanted to review –

**MR. MALLAMO:**

Maybe we can schedule a meeting just to talk about Vanderbilt issues.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

Only Vanderbilt. I think we will designate a whole meeting.

**MR. MALLAMO:**

I would love the opportunity to do that.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

Okay. Thank you. Fred, did you want to add anything to this?

**MR. POLLERT:**

No, I think that is it.

**CHAIRPERSON FIELDS:**

Okay. Thank you. Anyone else? All right. We would like to allow the next meeting to occur. I thank you all for your help and attendance and input.

*(The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.)*

{ } Denotes Spelled Phonetically